

## Appendix 1: Supplementary tables A-C [posted as supplied by author]

<b>Table A   Newcastle-Ottawa Scale for assessing the quality of studies in meta-Analysis</b>									
Study	Selection Representativeness of the exposed cohort	Selection of the non exposed cohort	Ascertain ment of exposure	Demonstration that outcome of interest was not present at start of study	Comparability Comparability of cohorts on the basis of the design or analysis	Outcome Assessment of outcome	Was follow-up long enough for outcomes to occur	Adequacy of follow up of cohorts	Quality score
Bellavia et al 2013	*	*		*	**	*	*	*	8
Leenders et al 2013	*	*		*	**	*	*	*	8
Zhang et al 2011 (men)	*	*	*		**	*		*	7
Zhang et al 2011 (women)	*	*	*		**	*	*	*	8
Nagura et al 2009	*	*		*	**	*	*	*	8
Nakamura et al 2008	*	*	*		**	*	*		7
Tucker et al 2005	*	*			**	*	*		6
Genkinger et al 2004	*	*			**	*	*		6
Steffen et al 2003	*	*	*	*	**	*	*	*	9
Sauvaget et al 2003		*		*	**	*	*	*	7
Bazzano et al 2002	*	*	*	*	**	*	*	*	9
Rissanen et al 2002	*	*		*	**	*	*	*	8
Strandhagen et al 2000		*	*			*	*	*	5
Whiteman et al 1999	*	*		*	*	*	*		6
Hertog et al 1996	*	*			**	*	*	*	7
Sahyoun et al 1996		*		*	**	*	*	*	7
Colditz et al 1985		*		*	*	*	*		5
Note: A study can be awarded a maximum of one star for each numbered item within the Selection and Outcome categories. A maximum of two stars can be given for Comparability.									

**Table B | Sensitivity analysis of consumption of fruits and vegetables combined and risk of all-cause mortality.**

Variable	No of studies	HR* (95% CI)	P	I <sup>2</sup> , P†
Exclude a study by Leenders et al (largest sample size)	6	0.94 (0.93 to 0.96)	0.001	0.0, 0.43
Studies that include both levels of multivariable adjustment‡	7	0.95 (0.92 to 0.98)	0.001	82.4, 0.001
Studies that included energy adjustment	5	0.95 (0.93 to 0.96)	0.001	10.2, 0.35
Studies that included physical activity adjustment	5	0.96 (0.94 to 0.99)	0.008	80.8, 0.001
Studies that had some form of adjustment for socioeconomic status (such as education, or income level)	4	0.96 (0.94 to 0.99)	0.019	84.6, 0.001

CI=confidence interval; HR=hazard ratio.  
\* Per 1 serving/day.  
†P for heterogeneity.  
‡Degree of sociodemographics plus other risk factors.

**Table C | Sensitivity analysis of consumption of fruits or vegetables and risk of all-cause, cardiovascular, and cancer mortality by excluding a study by Strandhagen et al.**

Comparison	No of studies	Pooled HR* (95% CI)	P	I <sup>2</sup> , P†
<b>All-cause mortality</b>				
Fruits	6	0.94 (0.90 to 0.98)	0.006	78.9, <0.001
Vegetables	6	0.95 (0.92 to 0.99)	0.009	88.4, <0.001
<b>CVD mortality</b>				
Fruits	5	0.96 (0.92 to 1.00)	0.05	72.3, 0.006
Vegetables	5	0.96 (0.93 to 1.00)	0.03	68.0, 0.014
<b>Cancer mortality</b>				
Fruits	6	0.99 (0.97 to 1.00)	0.09	26.5, 0.24
Vegetables	7	0.99 (0.97 to 1.01)	0.19	44.7, 0.09
CI=confidence interval; CVD=cardiovascular disease; HR=hazard ratio.				
*Per 1 serving/day.				
†P for heterogeneity.				